



APPROVED Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, October 21, 2014, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock, Members Gulatee, Kennerley and Schlecht.

ABSENT: Chairman Grover and Trustee Liaison McDonough.

ALSO PRESENT: Steve McNellis, Community & Economic Development Director, Stephen Robles, Village Planner and Tonya Zozulya, Economic Development Coordinator.

CALL TO ORDER: Director McNellis noted that Chairman Grover would be absent and had requested the ARB consider electing Roger Hardnock, as the most Senior attending member Chairman Pro Tem for this meeting. After discussion the ARB agreed and Member Hardnock agreed to act as Chairman Pro Tem and called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **Director McNellis** and **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Architectural Review Board Meeting held Tuesday, September 16, 2014.

Member Schlecht moved and **Member Gulatee** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board held on September 16, 2014, as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Continued Consideration and Discussion of a Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Building Elevations, Materials and Colors, and site lighting for a proposed four-level parking structure at 25/75 Tri-State International Office Center (Trammell Crow Company/Principal Real Estate Investors).

Director McNellis presented a summary of the issues discussed at the September "workshop" on this proposal. He noted the ARB direction was to break-up the north façade of the parking deck, sync the deck design with the office building and prepare a Landscape Plan that accentuated the deck, rather than creating a screen wall.



Member Gulatee inquired if the number of parking spaces provided exceeds the minimum required in the Zoning Code, does it require a variance? **Director McNellis** stated it did not, and that the petitioner must meet the minimum standard, but there is no maximum threshold. It is only required that the Village approve any parking plan. He further noted there are other existing commercial centers that also exceed the minimum requirements.

Member Gulatee noted if you have 500 more parking spaces, you probably have 500 more people in the building. In considering that, has the Architect reviewed whether or not stairs, restrooms, etc. fit or can be made to fit the new occupancy requirements? **Project Architect Roger Heerema**, principal of Wright Heerema Architects, stated they have not looked at it, but it's more of a Building Permitting question to be addressed at that time. He went on to introduce the team and present the existing and proposed plans. Architect Heerema stated the current parking ratio on this site is 3.61 spaces per 1000 sq. ft. and the proposed deck would bring it up to 5.26 spaces per 1000 sq. ft., which would mean an additional 524 spaces on the site.

Project Landscape Architect David McCallum, Principal of David R. McCallum Associates, presented the landscape proposal. He noted plant selections are salt tolerant, both airborne salt and soil-accumulated salt.

Member Kennerley asked what kind of low growing bushes are proposed, to which Landscape Architect McCallum stated they would be sumac and forsythia. **Member Kennerley** noted they lose their leaves, correct? She further noted it is important to have some evergreen bushes to maintain year-round greenery. She asked if Junipers or something similar could be added to provide that intermittent evergreen. **Landscape Architect McCallum** stated he hasn't found Junipers to be very salt-tolerant. However, he noted there are evergreen groundcovers that get a maximum height of 6-8". **Member Kennerley** requested that groundcover be mixed-in, perhaps around building entries, where it would be prominent.

Member Schlect asked if the Landscape Architect could tell him the mature height of the overall planting screen in relation to the height of the final architecture. **Landscape Architect McCallum** said he anticipated the evergreen trees to be 30-60' tall, with an average of 40-50'. He expects the shade and columnar deciduous trees to be 35-40' and the ornamental trees to be 15'. The height of the parking structure is 35-40'.

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock asked if Staff's recommendations for landscaping are represented in the plans. **Director McNellis** stated they are not, but Staff's understanding is the petitioner is comfortable meeting those requests if the ARB is supportive of them. **Grady Hamilton** of Trammell Crow, on behalf of the petitioner, confirmed the requests would be met.

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock asked why Staff wanted low plantings at the base of the deck. **Director McNellis** noted the overall design has horizontal architectural elements that help screen, so Staff believes it is important to get these low plantings



at the base to help screen and break up the longest part of the elevation, as well as ground the building.

Project Architect Heerema discussed ingress and egress to the deck. **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** inquired about the safety of the northernmost stairwell that exits right at the main vehicular entrance to the deck. Project Architect Heerema stated they believe the majority of garage-users will gravitate toward the center elevator and stairwell structure. **Mr. Hamilton** stated as far as safety at the north stairtower they would consider a painted crosswalk at the north vehicular ingress to the deck. He further noted they ultimately want to get people out of the deck, across the parking lot to the closest building entry. Further, he believes people will form patterns as to their entrance to the building. Finally, he noted they would consider adding a clearance guide, showing maximum permissible vehicle height entering the deck, as it also would act as a good traffic calming measure. **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** stated he was just raising awareness of the issue because the proposal for a No-Stop left turn lane on the main entry road will help speed cars up to get them in the deck, so this could be a hot spot.

Project Architect Heerema stated they had responded to a lot of commentary from the last meeting. He noted the ARB encouraged them to articulate the building so it looks less like a parking deck and more like a building. There was commentary on how the corners were treated and ways to break down the length of the deck façade. He further described the façade treatments, including glass elements to break the north façade into three sections, and the fins acting as a horizontal and vertical treatment to break up the façade.

Member Kennerley inquired if the fins block wind or are they just an architectural element? **Project Architect Heerema** stated they block some wind, but they're not clear on how much at this point. He further noted the glass elements offer additional enclosure.

Member Kennerley stated since we went through a signage package that was approved for a blue color theme, why would the petitioner consider red fins as an option? She noted her position that they should stick with the blue fins and the blue theme. **Mr. Hamilton** said they suggested the red and blue alternatives so they could offer the tenant a color to match their branding schemes. Member Kennerley asked the color of the tenants logo. Mr. Hamilton stated it would likely be red, but the fins could also possibly be unpainted if that was [preferred by the ARB].

Member Gulatee asked if there is architectural lighting on the deck façade. He noted there is shade and shadow present to add interest during the day, but what adds interest at night? **Project Architect Heerema** stated there were no plans to illuminate the exterior of the façade. **Member Gulatee** suggested the project architect consider "metal fabric" on the façade as it can change color at different angles to bring some interest. **Mr. Hamilton** mentioned in the evening they believe it is more important to draw attention to the light of the office building. **Member Gualtee** continued on lighting issues and asked if you're going to be 60' away from the deck in the office building, won't headlights shine into the office



building windows? To which Project Architect Heerema answered the spandrel is at 3'-6", so it will block the headlights. **Mr. Hamilton** furthered this proximity is not unprecedented in the suburbs.

Member Gulatee asked how the Architect was able to bring the height of the deck down from 53' at the last meeting to 40' now. **Project Architect Heerema** stated when they got into the details they were able to refine the deck. It is now typical of a parking structure design.

Member Gulatee asked what the Village Board thought of the parking deck location, as it has a mass to it, that he didn't believe is obvious on the elevations. **Director McNellis** stated as far as the Village Board, the only meeting they've seen this proposal is the preliminary Evaluation meeting. At that meeting the Board talked only about big picture ideas. The Board did receive the massing plans that the ARB received in September. Director McNellis noted he couldn't say if they had any concerns, but only say there was an absence of comments regarding the location. **Member Gulatee** then inquired if the Village Board is letting the ARB decide the location in which the deck best works. He noted a 3-D model would be the first step to make that determination. He further noted the deck has a presence and he feels uncomfortable talking about it without a 3-D model. **Member Kennerley** stated a 3-D model isn't something she would look at the same way as Member Gulatee. She further noted the photo montages give her a realistic understanding of the end product, so for her what has been provided makes sense.

Project Architect Heerema continued reviewing the sections and exhibit demonstrating the relationship of the height of the adjacent tollway on-ramp to the parking deck height. **Member Schlect** asked if the section illustrates the actual distance of the on-ramp from the deck? **Project Architect Heerema** stated it was intended to represent that, but doesn't appear to show the proper distance.

Project Architect Heerema went on to discuss building materials and noted the coated pre-cast concrete panels will be slightly darker than the building. He confirmed no additional detention would be necessary, per the determination of Lake County Stormwater Management Commission. He then presented the Photometric plans and light levels. **Member Gulatee** inquired as to the light pole height on the top floor of the parking deck, and are there cut-offs for the lights. **Project Architect Heerema** stated the light fixtures are 18' tall and the light cutoff is at the edge of the deck. They selected a light fixture consistent with the rest of the development.

Member Schlect stated he will keep his comments to the architectural character and development. He noted he believes the project is fundamentally flawed. The massing of the deck is bigger than the biggest existing building on the site. Its at least 25% bigger. You're blocking $\frac{3}{4}$ of building tenant views which devalues the building. You're not respecting setbacks which devalues the whole property. Member Schlect summed up his comment by noting he cant say this is a good



idea. There are bigger setbacks between 75 and 100 buildings than between the buildings and the deck. The façade looks like its just decoration and Member Schlect noted he can't personally recommend it.

Member Kennerley noted if they do fins, its important they block wind. If the color of the fins is not to be blue, it should be black. Non-colored steel doesn't work with the color palette. **Mr. Hamilton** stated the color wasn't so much driven by the tenant than it was Trammell Crow trying to create an effect. **Member Kennerley** stated blue is the better option, as it matches the signage. **Mr. Hamilton** noted they'd be comfortable with blue or black. **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** noted he's not opposed to the red on the rendering, but blue or black are ok. **Member Gulatee** stated the building and siting are more important than fin colors. He noted he sent a memo to everyone echoing this point on siting.

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock asked if there was anywhere else on site it would work? He noted he didn't think so. He further noted we need more parking here, it's a functional necessity. Right now its 2 acres of asphalt. That looks far worse than anything they'd put there, stated Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock.

Member Gulatee asked if the petitioner had looked at siting the deck between the 100 and 75 buildings. He further noted this proposal puts a garage too close to the office building. You can never justify this adds value 70' from the office building. **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** noted this is a retrofit. The tenants will be primarily in 25 and 75 Tri-State so why wouldn't you want the deck adjacent to them?

Mr. Hamilton said they've looked at all sighting possibilities, and they want to preserve the presence of the buildings from the most important views on the Tollway. He further noted the tenant is leaving a building in the suburbs that cant adequately park them. Ownership has viewed this, as has the tenant, and this is the tenant's preference.

Member Schlect said our point as ARB is to recommend architecture. Its up to the Village Board to look at other aspects. That's their call as the Village Board, and its not up to the ARB to talk about tenants or occupancies.

Member Gulatee stated architecture isn't just the building, its also where its located. **Mr. Hamilton** noted the reasons for this location are many; geographical, topographical, utility conflicts, etc. he stated they are trying to find the best place given the constraints.

Member Gulatee stated his opinion that if you don't do a 3-D model, you won't understand the impacts.

Member Schlect stated his preference to go ahead and vote. **Director McNellis** stated that getting into the details of conditions or stipulations on a vote doesn't seem like a wise use of time when two of four members present here are likely voting against it. So, if nothing can be done to convince one of those two



members that there are revisions or conditions that will change their mind, then looking at conditions doesn't make sense because the vote would be a tie, which is not an affirmative recommendation.

Member Gulatee inquired as to the Village Board's thoughts on the proposal. **Director McNellis** noted there were no particular negative comments at the Village Board. No concerns were voiced, but there was agreement a Traffic Study was needed.

Member Gulatee stated the Village should always insist on an actual model.

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock stated we're not designing from scratch here. This is a retrofit with a lot of factors. He stated he would not move the proposed location, as he thinks the effect is the same. He further noted he believes what was done architecturally to merge the deck with the building is nice, and they've done a nice job overall. He stated he didn't believe it could be done any better.

Member Gulatee asked if the petitioner could take advantage of the change in grade around the site. **Mr. Hamilton** stated they have tried to do that with the Tollway on-ramp. He believes the consensus, including the Village and neighbors, is that this is the best location. He also noted its critical they get to the Village Board soon to remain a candidate for this project.

Director McNellis noted if there were any stipulations that would satisfy the ARB to be able to make a positive recommendation, then the Petitioners are here ready and willing to make these stipulations and hear what you have to say. **Member Schlect** noted what he and Member Gulatee are saying is that we have only seen one location option. We haven't seen any other locations and can't comment on what we haven't seen.

Mr. Hamilton noted at the last ARB meeting in September, the direction was to look into building fenestration, not anything else. He noted they looked at taller structures in other areas but it was prohibitive visually and for other reasons. He further stated at the last ARB they were asked only to look at breaking-up the façade. **Member Schlect** countered that the ARB was concerned about location at the last meeting. He felt that the Village Board can talk about other non-design considerations but not the ARB. Finally, he said to the petitioner if they believe this is their strongest position, then let's vote. **Director McNellis** noted if there is not a positive vote then at the Village Board the petitioner will need a supermajority vote. So, the petitioner is simply saying if there is anything they can do to determine stipulations that might gain approval, then that would help them in not having to overcome that supermajority vote hurdle at the Village Board meeting.

Member Gulatee stated he feels there are major internal traffic issues on this site. He also acknowledged there is a Traffic Study being commissioned.



Member Kennerley asked if Staff had seen any other possible siting locations. **Director McNellis** stated we have discussed a few other locations, primarily on the front side of the 25/75 buildings, and in that case the deck had to be much taller. He further noted that sliding the building further south along the Tollway takes it away from the greatest building population density, which is at 25/75. From a Staff point-of-view, we couldn't find another good place for it. If you move it further south, it will obscure views to and from the southern part of the campus.

Member Schlect inquired as to the date of the zoning review, to which Director McNellis stated next week (October 27th). Director McNellis further went on to state its important the petitioner be able to make their case for stipulations that could accompany an approval, and not have the Village throw in the towel too early. He reiterated Staff is in support of the proposal.

Mr. Hamilton stated the least visible location on this site is the corner. It is the most obscured place on the property. He further noted it's a long deck because they have been sensitive to height. He wondered what the ARB would think if it was shorter in length, but taller. They could do that. As for suggestions there is a better location on this site, he noted the tenant doesn't want their view and identity on the Tollway obscured.

Member Gulatee asked why couldn't you place the deck between the 75 and 100 buildings. **Mr. Hamilton** noted you would completely block the buildings if you do that, and the tenant won't accept that location. Also, he noted the utilities create a web of constraint on the site.

John Carlson of Trammell Crow, asked if a change in location would also require more zoning relief. **Director McNellis** stated if you move the deck further south, more zoning exceptions would be needed, but perhaps just one more. However, if the Village had to permit 5 exceptions to get the deck in the right spot, he believes that would be acceptable. He stated that ultimately from a Staff point-of-view we support this location because it's the least impactful to all affected parties. **Member Gulatee** stated that if you move the deck further south, more of the office building is visible. **Director McNellis** stated his belief that moving the deck further south makes the deck more prominent on the Tollway and obscures more of the office buildings.

Mr. Carlson asked if it was true that the Sutton Place Townhome Association President was happy to hear the building would not be in their view. **Director McNellis** stated yes, his main comment was it was good that it wouldn't be in their view. **Mr. Hamilton** furthered this point by stating the 25 building even today is almost invisible, and its value for visibility on the Tollway is limited. He suggested perhaps they could shorten the length of the deck and increase the height to have it obscure less of the office buildings along the Tollway.

Member Schlect asked Mr. Hamilton if they had studied burying the deck by two or more floors. **Mr. Hamilton** noted utilities are a problem and a barrier to deepening the structure, but cost is also definitely an issue. He further noted that



there is not an opportunity to connect to an underground level of the office building, which could have made it feasible. He said underground parking in suburban areas is typically only there when its connected to an underground level of an office building.

Member Schlect inquired as to why the 300 building is full and the others are not. **Mr. Hamilton** stated 300 has been full with leases for a long time, whereas 25/75 have been vacant buildings for several years. **Director McNellis** noted 25/75 are vacant because they were occupied by one large tenant, CVS Caremark, who moved out at one time years ago.

Kelly Morrissey, Property Manager with Colliers, and managing the Tri-State International office Center noted CVS/Caremark was lost because there wasn't enough parking available for them. They were requesting 5-6/1,000 sq. ft. It wasn't about economics.

Member Schlect inquired what it was that was being proposed here that others in this market have had to do? To which **Mr. Hamilton** noted the Astellas project on Willow Road, as an example of a parking deck that needed to be built. **Member Schlect** stated he was familiar with the project, but that it was different in that Astellas buried it and placed a lot of architectural detail on it. **Mr. Hamilton** noted they did start from scratch, however. He further noted Westlake of Conway Farms as an example of where they're building decks because 4/1,000 parking space ratio doesn't work. He also noted Harris Bank in Naperville, in which a building was formerly vacant for 7 years, and then Harris Bank moved in with a stipulation for a parking deck along the Tollway. That deck has since been built.

Member Kennerley asked if the Petitioner's were able to show an existing building with a similar structure added after the fact, if the ARB would say they're ok with that? **Member Schlect** responded No, he doesn't think this is acceptable because this deck is 2 football fields long. Member Schlect noted he believes that fundamentally this is the wrong place and the massing is wrong. He further went on to note that the mission of the ARB is to maintain value of the site and this doesn't do that. The Village Board can look at the leasing end of this, but Mr. Schlect he was talking about architecture and that alone.

Mr. Carlson stated the Petitioner wants to get to the Village Board with any stipulations and they respectfully request the right to move forward. **Member Gulatee** asked if the Village sees the ARB as only dealing with architectural detailing on a building, because if so, then their recommendation on siting the building shouldn't count. **Director McNellis** stated no one has said that. The ARB is responsible for site plan, landscape plan, building elevations and signage for a reason. They're under the ARB's per view and you should respond. Village Board and Staff are certainly not saying the ARB is responsible only for decoration on a building.

Member Gulatee stated that value is being taken away from the office buildings.



Architect Heerema noted there are probably four main issues here: siting of the deck, massing, proximity to building and the architecture itself. Taking each issue, he noted that with massing, they could increase the deck by one level and reduce the length of it, but it would change the views to the buildings. As far as siting, he noted we're not starting with a clean slate. So the question is – where can we most-sensitively put in a new deck. Architect Heerema went on to He further went on to state the northern location is best from a planning and functional perspective, because it's the closest to people who are using it. **Member Gulatee** noted he respected what the architect was saying about building-parking deck proximity. They've done this before. **Architect Heerema** noted the good news is there won't be many cars travelling on the drive aisle adjacent to the building (between the building and the deck), and it will become more of a pedestrian space. He further noted people are more concerned these days about how spaces work internally, rather than the views in or out. He noted the Merchandise Mart in Chicago as an example. He stated that building has huge floor plates and is the hottest in Downtown, even though you're 100' from any window, but yet its still a tech-center. Its about whats happening in the space.

Member Gulatee asked how you best serve the existing site. He noted he was uncomfortable with the plan and asked if you could sink a floor or two of the deck into the ground? **Mr. Hamilton** stated they can't sink the deck into the ground. The cost and utility challenges mean it cant be done. He further noted the Tenant prefers the visibility of their office building on the Tollway. He also mentioned that moving the deck further south would make it more visible to the neighbors.

Member Gulatee said he believes the best spot is to move it south between 75 and 100 Tri-State. **Mr. Hamilton** noted if you move it south, you'll conceal two buildings entirely; including the 75 building, and the Tenant won't accept that. He noted this company hires a lot of Millennials, and there is not a company culture concerned about window visibility. Mr. Hamilton continued that this site is similar to the Aon/Hewitt site to the north. That site is essentially vacant now but its also underparked. Anyone interested in that property will be coming to the Village asking for a parking deck, in Mr. Hamilton's opinion. Mr. Hamilton reiterated his company believes this is the best location and the Tenant would agree, and they believe the residents would too.

Member Gulatee stated we don't know exactly how much parking you need. How scientific is the actual need for parking spaces? **Mr. Hamilton** responded the Tenant has said they will only come to this site if there are 500 more spaces. **Member Schlect** stated no one is arguing the need for parking. You're saying you want bury a level or two in the ground because its too costly. **Mr. Hamilton** noted its also a safety issue. **Member Schlect** noted he has a difference of opinion with the Petitioner on burying it. He inquired how do you know the next tenant would also want a parking garage in front of their building? **Mr. Hamilton** stated in the future this property will be more successful to lease with this parking structure in place. Mr. Hamilton inquired if Mr. Schlect believed that parking is needed? **Member Schlect** stated he didn't know. He mentioned the ARB has



only really seen this over the past three days. The ARB doesn't see the "behind the scenes". He noted he isn't sold this is the best way to provide parking for the site.

Mr. Hamilton stated after the last ARB meeting, and in talking with Staff, we all believed it was the architectural fenestration we were here to discuss. He also noted that the windows of the office building that are facing the deck will likely be utilized more as public space within the tenant offices, rather than individual's offices. **Member Schlect** noted that any please regarding the leasing and economics of the site should be made to the Village Board, not the ARB, as it not in the ARB's per view.

Mr. Carlson weighed-in on the topic of considering moving the parking structure further south. He noted if you do this you will block views of other tenants that have been at the park for years, whereas any blocked views at 25/75 buildings are ones the prospective tenant comes into with eyes wide open.

Director McNellis noted his impression that Member Gulatee has not changed his position and that he believes this location is not the best. **Mr. Hamilton** drew attention to a sketch concept provided by Member Schlect in which the parking structure is placed even closer to the office building and architecturally becomes an extension of the office building. There was limited discussion on this proposal.

Member Gulatee stated the site is hemmed-in and this siting solution doesn't seem to be the best option.

Member Schlect asked about Staff's comment that a Supermajority vote would be needed at the Village Board if the recommendation is a tie, and therefore fails to achieve a positive recommendation. **Director McNellis** said Staff is recommending a vote tonight, regardless of what the anticipated outcome might be. A Supermajority vote requires five members of the sitting Village board to vote in favor to be approved. This would then create another hurdle the Petitioner would have to overcome, since more votes are needed. He also mentioned Staff does not want to short-change the petitioner. If they can come up with a way to satisfy everybody, then they should be afforded that opportunity. At this point, Director McNellis believes they have been provided that opportunity. Unless any new information is available, it would seem the petitioner and ARB have done all they can and it may be time to take a vote. **Ms. Morrissey** noted her hope that this proposal can get before the Village Board so we can start the work to rejuvenate this asset.

Director McNellis stated the Petitioner can either request to wait another meeting to address the concerns voiced tonight or they can request a vote. **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** noted he would like to get something that works for everyone. He inquired of the dissenting ARB members what it would take, whether it's a Study or something else, for them to determine the parking deck is in the right location? **Member Schlect** stated we've been round and round on location. He believes they have fairly strong merits upon which to go to the



Village Board, but he feels he needs to be able to look the Village Board in the eye and right now he just can't say this is a good idea. He feels studies or other reports won't change that.

Director McNellis noted the ARB's per view is site, landscaping, building elevations, etc. Architecture of site design is in ARB's per view. If the ARB believes the location of the deck hasn't been appropriately addressed, then the ARB members should simply vote their conscience.

Mr. Hamilton stated he didn't believe there were many other locations this could be sited. He asked the ARB if they had a better idea to please let him know. **Member Gulatee** inquired as to whether or not this property was even big enough to adequately hold a parking structure. **Director McNellis** noted the Petitioner has made a request and determined they believe it is appropriate to build a garage here. If the ARB doesn't agree, then they should vote against it. Ultimately, we have a proposal and the petitioner is requesting feedback. If the ARB doesn't believe they made their case, you should vote accordingly. If there's something the petitioner can do to change your position, then the ARB should make those stipulations. However, it seems we are at a standstill.

Mr. Hamilton inquired as to what would make it approvable to the ARB? He further inquired if the ARB could reconvene on this subject sooner than a month from this date. Finally, he asked if there are specific changes that he and his team can make, he'd like to know what those should be.

Architect Heerema noted Member Gulatee had talked about modifications. He asked if they raised the deck by another level, but reduced the length, would that become more palatable. **Member Gulatee** answered No, as he countered the deck should be reduced and the levels buried. Architect Heerema further noted they don't have a physical 3-D model here tonight. He stated if they reduce the deck by one level that would be a 25' tall deck. Would that help? **Mr. Hamilton** asked if Member Gulatee would support that proposal, to which Member Gulatee noted it would help, but he would want to see it in 3-D, and subject to a study of elevational changes.

Director McNellis stated if the Petitioner feels they could respond to these comments by the week of November 3rd, the ARB could hold a Special meeting and then go to the Village Board on November 10th.

Mr. Hamilton stated they would need better guidance, but could be prepared for the week of November 3rd and would look at the costs of placing a level of the parking deck underground. **Director McNellis** noted that in order to do this the ARB would need to provide detailed feedback so the Petitioner can be sure to address everything.

Member Schlect suggested he believes it comes down to architectural integrity. He noted he understands its not a fresh clean site, but this is still a 600' long building. The zoning hasn't even been resolved yet. He further stated he



understands it's a tough site, but its not the ARB's job to design it. He stated he continues to believe the plan is flawed. He noted an example of driving on the Tollway on-ramp from Rt. 60 and seeing Costco adjacent, only a 600' long parking deck would be even longer than that parking area.

Member Kennerley stated she would like to see some additional information on wind and how it will potentially create drafts. She further mentioned she was hoping to see two options. One had fins but what was the second option? Perhaps you could close one side of the deck?

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock asked if there were any other comments on the design of the structure? **Member Kennerley** also added she had made a recommendation about more green space at the base to soften it up.+ **Member Gulatee** noted you can't discuss design until you look at height. After all, the fins concept may not work if you drop the height above ground by one level. **Architect Heerema** stated they would look at the height. **Member Kennerley** stated when they come back at the next meeting, we need to resolve this. So, lets get all the questions on the table now.

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock asked for comments on a new concept he'd like to suggest. What if you both raise and lower the number of levels? You have three sections of the parking deck, and on the north end you have the elevational advantage of the ramp, so what if you went a level higher at the north end, had three levels in the middle and maybe one level at the south end? You would essentially step it down. **Architect Heerema** mentioned they could consider that, to which Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock asked if they could go approximately 4' into the ground at the south end.

Director McNellis asked if November 3rd would work for the ARB. That might be the better date for the Village and the Petitioner. The ARB was in general consensus.

Member Schlect stated there was a fundamental architectural tradeoff on this project and he believes it's the ARB's mission to protect the architectural integrity.

Director McNellis asked the ARB if they wanted to give the Petitioner another opportunity to try to address the comments heard here this evening? There was a consensus to do so. The review process and ramifications were then discussed between the ARB and Staff.

Director McNellis noted that it was now 10:30 P.M., and per the policy of the ARB, it was necessary to vote to agree to extend the meeting time by no more than 30 minutes, to 11 P.M. The ARB voted affirmatively, by voice vote, to extend the meeting by no more than 30 minutes.

Architect Heerema stated they would evaluate the cost of changing the deck levels, per the step-approach. He noted he thought it was a viable option. He



also noted they would have to discuss this with the prospective tenant. Finally, he stated they would look at all the comments and come back with some alternatives.

Mr. Hamilton said it sounds like there may be support for a stepped solution. He asked the ARB if they came back and presented a stepped deck in that location, would that work for you? The ARB generally answered affirmatively. Mr. Hamilton further noted the main issue he sees is the issue of efficiency of parking stalls on the site. He said they would look at it.

Member Schlect asked why Zoning didn't look at this first. **Director McNellis** answered that this is the Village's review process, by Code. If matters involve a PUD, the Village Board holds a Public Hearing on zoning matters and it occurs after the ARB review. The review process from here forward was then discussed.

Member Schlect asked if the Traffic Study had been done yet, because he believes there are fundamental questions about this project. **Director McNellis** stated Staff has just received the Traffic Study and we're still reviewing it. The conclusion states the intersection can handle the new traffic, but we haven't yet reviewed the details. **Director McNellis** then inquired with this direction, is the ARB requesting to continue this discussion to a Special ARB meeting on November 3rd? There was a consensus of the ARB to do so.

- 3.2 PUBLIC HEARING regarding text amendments to various sections of Title 12, Sign Control, of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise and clarify requirements for permanent and temporary signs (Village of Lincolnshire).

Director McNellis noted Staff would request this agenda item be opened and continued, given the late hour.

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock recessed the ARB meeting and opened the Public Hearing. With the consent of the ARB, the Chairman continued the Public Hearing to the next regularly-scheduled ARB meeting on November 18th, and reopened the ARB meeting.

- 3.3 Consideration and Discussion regarding concepts and objectives for the Update to the Lincolnshire Design Guidelines (Village of Lincolnshire).

Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock noted that per Staff's recommendation, he would propose continuing discussion on this agenda item. The ARB discussed the timing of the review of these guidelines and there was a consensus to place this review on the next regularly-scheduled meeting in November, unless the agenda was such that there would not be sufficient time to invest in the review that evening. If the agenda would not permit adequate review time the ARB expressed support for moving this review back to the beginning of 2015.



- 4.0 **UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**
- 5.0 **NEW BUSINESS (None)**
- 6.0 **CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**
- 7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Chairman Pro Tem Hardnock** sought a motion for adjournment. **Member Schlecht** moved, and **Member Kennerley** seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Steve McNellis, Director of Community and Economic Development.